Harold Weisberg
Hyattstown, Md. 20734
August 18, 1966

Mr. Donald Stanley
The San Fransisco Examiner
San Fransisco, Calif.

Dear Mr. Stanley,

One of the readers of your paper and my book has kindly sent me a copy of your interesting and worthwhile column of the 14th. You certainly take a less biased and more evenhanded approach than most newsmen today, and I do thank you for the mention of my book, which seems to be doing rather well, despite its unusual handicaps, in your lively town.

Had you not used the word "extremist" in referring to my book, I'd probably have said to myself, "Wish I could afford to take the time from what I'm now doing to thank him", and kept on with the work for which there isn't enough time. I do thank you, but I cannot allow this one word and one other thing to pass unchallenged.

Whitewash is the first of all the writing you mentioned. It was completed in mid-February 1965. It was published that summer. None of the writing from which you quote, none you mention, have added anything material to what I have in Whitewash. If I'm wrong, please show me. I can show you as much fact as all the other books together have in Whitewash and enough more to make more than another book had I not chosen to keep it terse and adhere strictly to what could be considered fact. Recall, there is nothing in my book not from the evidence.

To take but one of the examples of what you, in your own editorial judgement attributed to the Johnny-come-laterly of the books, Lones, the police car at Oswald rooming house, reread both treatments and see if I do not have all he has and more -what is typical of WHITEWASH - what he and all the others do not have on this police car. To give you an idea of the many such things, just compare the tables of contents and the organizations of the books. Mine alone has the complete stories of the Oswalds' government relations; all of the essentials on the Number of Shots and the Doctors and the Autopsy - no where else will your readers get this most basic of all information, and in the words of the transcript - including photographic reproduction of the certification of the burning of the first draft of the President's autopsy and excerpts from the altered, oldest existing draft; the entire story of The False Oswald, not one edited to suit the political beliefs of other authors who wrote about the same thing much later and without credit to WHITEWASH; The Witnesses and Their Treatment; and even in the brief for the accused you will not find the content and the laborious comparison of the so called interrogation reports that show how Oswald was completely and systematically denied his rights.

It is a strange irony that WHITEWASH, the first yet still the most complete, the strongest and the factually unassailable one of the books is also the one that without axe-grinding puts the position of the members of the Commission in perspective. It did this without editing out all the names of all the assistant counsel, who really did the work, despite contrary opinions held by those you in part quote.

Perhaps you did not intend what I understand by "extremist". The context in which you employed the word is as it describes the Report. If you had seen fit to reveal any of the contents of WHITEWASH, perhaps your readers might for themselves have been in a somewhat better position to decide whether the book is in any way extreme. I am confident the opposite is true. This is one of the reasons why I alone among the authors of the books you reported on restricted myself entirely to the Commission's own evidence, the evidence upon which the Report was allegedly based, the evidence upon which the members of the Commission were to reach conclusions.

Therefore I would like to make a simple offer to you. There are some things that are quite comprehensible about which your readers will have little difficulty understanding whether or not simple human error could have been involved. Gladly do I give you permission to use these things, should you so desire. They are, may I add, in no other book.

Page 187, the certification of the burning of the first draft of the President's autopsy and the appropriate text. You will note that the assistant counsel interrogating the doctor who was in charge of the autopsy and who drafted it accepted the burning of this historically and legally important document as something as natural as breathing.

Page 195 and the appropriate text, excerpts from the first of the FBI reports to the Commission. This was reproduced in facsimile first in WHITEWASH, which in the text contains an additional eight ~~additional~~ references to it.

Pages 196-7, the official autopsy charts and the doctors' testimony about them, against first in WHITEWASH and to this day only in WHITEWASH with quotations from all the applicable medical testimony. You are welcome to use whatever text you find appropriate. And by all means page 198, where alone in all the books your readers will see photographic samples of the substantive changes in the President's autopsy in the handwriting of the doctor in charge, especially the use and deletion of the word "puncture". Here is the revelation that two days after the late President was assassinated the autopsy chief still reported the Dallas doctors did, in fact, note that the President was shot from the front. This was a day and a half after the completion of the autopsy examination.

Page 200, the State Department's teletype leading to Oswald's overnight passport and the word "NO" after his name that the authors of the Report would like us to believe represented the identification of the office that sent the message. Here, as elsewhere, you may use the appropriate text.

You may perhaps have already purchased the rights to the picture accross the top of pages 202-3. It is a Wide World copyright. Compare it with the version used by the Commission, as photographed from the Report, below it. Such editing, as consistent as the text reflects it is "human error"? How "human" can some lawyers be? Perhaps you might even want to ask a member of the Commission if he ever saw the original. The staff lawyers introduced cropped versions into evidence.

Pages 204-5. How in the world could any crime with such great importance to fractions of a degree be reconstructed from such contradictory and entirely wrong beginning. All of these picture are wrong, and each is contradicted by all of the others (and I can give you still other versions if you want them), yet each is official and sworn to as accurate.

Perhaps worst of all is page 206. In WHITEWASH the first printer, who broke his agreement expressing fear of retaliation and destroyed the plates when the presses were ready to roll, also mutilated this pair of pictures. He caught this

only in time to make hasty correction when the book was finally printed elsewhere. But for your information, the proof of this negative was it was made is enclosed. I'd appreciate it's return. Here you can see it exactly as it appears on page 19 of volume 18. Examination of page 206 of WHITEWASH shows the amatour character of the elimination of just those frames of this movie the Commission itself says are crucial. Here, I'll acknowledge a different kind of human error: a professional should have done the job, for it is a terrible botch.

I do hope you will recognize as signs of good faith on my part my offer of the enclosed print, which is important to me, and of authorization to use any parts of the text you personally consider appropriate.

Perhaps, also, your SanFransisco readers will be interested in knowinmthat it was they, first among the big cities, who bought WHITEWASH in large numbers, and that despite the lack of those essential publishing facilities with which the other books are blessed, including public-relations staffs to make uninhibited claims that never have to confront reality, despite its unorthodox form, it had, by the end of the first week of August, sold more than 9,000 copies, rather a record for any private printing and a conspicuously good performance for any book, whatever its auspicies.

I do thank you for the mention, and I sincerely hope you'll let your readers decide <u>from the evidence</u> that WHITEWASH alone uses whether this designation of the investigation of the assassination of the late, beloved President is in any sense "extremist".

Sincerely yours,

Harold Weisberg

Dear Mr. Verb, I once tried to get at least one of those documents myself, and it is my recollection at least one is classified. Next trip in I'll try for you. Thanks for the letter and enclosures. Please keep this letter in confidence, but I'd like very much to see anything they might print.